# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

KEVIN CHAMBERS,	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	) No. 4:06-CV-440-DJS
WILLIAM TUCKER, et al.,	)
Defendants.	)

## ORDER AND MEMORANDUM

This matter is before the Court upon the application of Kevin Chambers for leave to commence this action without payment of the required filing fee. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Upon consideration of the financial information provided with the application, the Court finds that plaintiff is financially unable to pay any portion of the filing fee. Therefore, plaintiff will be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).

## 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis at any time if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if "it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." Neitzke v.

Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted if it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief. Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957); Jackson Sawmill Co. v. United States, 580 F.2d 302, 306 (8th Cir. 1978).

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. Denton v. Hernandez, 112 S. Ct. 1728, 1733 (1992); Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

### The complaint

Plaintiff seeks monetary relief in this action against defendants William Tucker (St. Louis County public defender), Robert McCullock (St. Louis County prosecuting attorney), St. Louis County, Missouri, Penny Cook (police officer), Unknown Kelling (police officer), Andria Van Mierlo (police officer), and Unknown Bone (police detective). Plaintiff alleges that defendants "conspired to deprive [him] of the right to counsel in a pending criminal case in St. Louis County, Missouri." Plaintiff claims that defendants are depriving him "of the right to present the state jury with all his evidence that the criminal charges [were]

filed as a coverup over the pending federal charges and federal law suits."

#### Discussion

In <u>Younger v. Harris</u>, 401 U.S. 37, 46 (1971), the Supreme Court directed federal courts to abstain from hearing cases where "the action complained of constitutes the basis of an ongoing state judicial proceeding, the proceedings implicate important state interests, and an adequate opportunity exists in the state proceedings to raise constitutional challenges." <u>Harmon v. City of Kansas City, Missouri</u>, 197 F.3d 321, 325 (8th Cir. 1999); <u>see also</u>, <u>Fuller v. Ulland</u>, 76 F.3d 957, 959 (8th Cir. 1996).

Having carefully reviewed the case at bar, the Court concludes that the <u>Younger</u> criteria are satisfied and that abstention is warranted. Plaintiff states that there is an ongoing criminal case in St. Louis County; plaintiff's allegations implicate important state interests; and an adequate opportunity exists in the state proceeding to raise constitutional challenges. Finding no "extraordinary circumstances" that would justify interfering with pending state judicial proceedings, the Court will dismiss the instant action, without prejudice. <u>See Younger</u>, 401 U.S. at 43-44.

In accordance with the foregoing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #1] is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, based upon the <u>Younger</u> abstention doctrine, the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint.

An appropriate order shall accompany this order and  $\operatorname{memorandum}$ .

Dated this <u>19th</u> day of May, 2006.

/s/Donald J. Stohr
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE